

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this paper, claims 1-5 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added as a new claims. Thus, claims 1-5 are presently pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

**Specification**

The disclosure was objected to because of the following informalities: the Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because it contains legal language: “comprises” and “means”; and reference to claim numbers in the specification (e.g. page 1) should be removed, since claims are dynamic and change during prosecution.

The Abstract has been amended to replace the legal terminology with more acceptable language. In addition, the references to claim numbers in the specification have also been removed and replaced with language directly taken from the claim previously referred to by number. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the above-noted objections.

**Claim Rejections under 35USC §112, second paragraph)**

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The claims were asserted to be indefinite because of the following reasons: the following terms lack antecedent basis: “the valve body” (claim 1, line 3); “the valve seat (claim 2, line 3); because “valve” appears multiple times in claim 1, the antecedent basis for “the valve body of the valve” of claim 2 is indeterminate; regarding claim 1, the phrases “such as an oil filter...” (line 1); “such as a check valve...” (line 2); and “such as an additional valve or...” (lines 5-6) render the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP 2173.05(d). Claims 2-5 were also rejected since they suffer the same defects as the claims from which they depend.

Claims 1-5 have been amended in various ways to more clearly claim the invention of the present application. The terms lacking antecedent basis, i.e., “the valve body” (claim 1) and “the valve seat (claim 2) now have antecedent basis based on their proper introduction in claim 1. The phrase “of the valve” has been deleted. In addition, the phrases “such as an oil filter...”; “such as a check valve...”; and “such as an additional valve or...” have also been deleted.

Applicants respectfully submit that all 35USC §112, second paragraph issues have been addressed and corrected. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections.

*Claim Rejections under 35USC §112, first paragraph)*

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims were asserted to contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. While being enabling for the tubular sleeve (18) forming the valve body for the drain valve (figures 4A, 4B), the specification was asserted to not “not reasonably provide enablement for the tubular sleeve also forming ‘and/or the drain valve’.” See OA, paragraph 5.

Applicants have removed the “and/or” language and respectfully submit that the amended claim is fully supported by the original specification, figures, and claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

*Claim Rejections under 35USC §102*

Claims 1-2 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Goddard (U.S. 6,068,763). Claims 1-2 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Gebert et al. (U.S. 5,589,060). Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ball (U.S. 3,268,077).

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 from which dependent claims 2-5 depend. Applicants further submit that none of the applied references, Goddard, Gebert, or Ball, disclose a filter having “. . . a filter housing having a filter base; a valve located in the filter housing, the valve having a valve body and a valve seat, wherein the valve seat is formed by the filter base;” *See* amended claim 1.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, Goddard, Gebert, or Ball, disclose a filter having “. . . a combination component; wherein the valve body is located in the combination component, and the combination component has a connector for connecting at least one additional filter component to the combination component, wherein the at least one additional filter component comprises a support dome.” *See* amended claim 1.

Independent claim 1, and therefore all claims depending therefrom, are allowable because they have been amended to better point out and distinctly claim the features of the invention. Support for the amended language can be found in the claims as originally presented, as well as throughout the specification, such that the addition of new matter has been scrupulously avoided.

Anticipation can only be established by a single prior art reference teaching each and every element of the claimed invention performing the identical function in the same way. Applicants respectfully submit that claimed aspects of the present invention are conspicuously absent from Goddard, Gebert, and Ball, and thus, there can be no anticipation.

In light of the above comments, applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present invention are not anticipated by, and are therefore in condition for allowance over, the cited documents. Such action is kindly requested.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants courteously solicit allowance of the claims in the form of a Notice of Allowance. Should there be any outstanding issues of patentability following the entry of this response, a telephone interview is respectfully requested to resolve such issues.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP

By   
Sean D. Detweiler  
Registration No.: 42,482

28 State Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109  
(617) 227-7400  
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)  
Attorney For Applicants